UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/812,417	03/30/2004	Sumit Agarwal	64557.000020 GP-254-00-US	1265

21967	7590	10/02/2006

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
1900 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109

EXAMINER
VAUTROT, DENNIS L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

DATE MAILED: 10/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/812,417	AGARWAL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dennis L. Vautrot	2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 March 2004</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-35</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-35</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>30 March 2004</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/6/05 & 11/15/05</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1.   The Applicants' Information Disclosure statements (IDS), filed 6 December 2005

and 16 November 2005 have been received and entered into the record. Since the IDS

filed on 6 December 2005 complies with the provisions of MPEP § 609, the references

cited therein have been considered by the examiner. See attached form PTO-1449.

2.   The Applicants' Information Disclosure Statement, filed on 16 November 2005,

has been received and entered into the record. The Information Disclosure Statement,

however, fails to comply with the provisions of MPEP § 609.

MPEP § 609.04(a)II states that

> "Electronic means or medium for filing IDSs are not permitted except for:
> (A) citations to U.S. patents and U.S. patent application publication in an IDS
> filed with the Office's Electronic Filing System (EFS) (see MPEP § 609.07); or (B)
> a compact disc (CD) that has tables, sequence listings, or program listings
> included in a paper IDS in compliance with 37 CFR § 1.52(e). A CD cannot be
> used to submit an IDS listing or copies of the documents cited in the IDS."

Since copies of the non-patent literature documents listed on the Applicants' IDS

have been submitted on CD in lieu of paper copies, these documents have not been

considered by the examiner.

See attached form PTO-1449.

Specification

3.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: In paragraph

[0054] "Rating aggregation module" is labeled 28, but is labeled 30 in the drawing.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the. applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5.   Claim 1, 2, 4, 7, 10, 17, 18, 24 – 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by **Hillis et al.** (hereinafter **Hillis**, US 2005/0131918).

6.   Regarding claim 1, **Hillis** discloses a method comprising the steps of: receiving

rating information associated with a document from one or more evaluators (See page

3, paragraph [0028] "Each of the evaluation systems that have evaluated the content of

interest returns a rating, preferably numeric.");

receiving a signal [request] relevant to a criteria (See page 2, paragraph [0026]

"Alternatively, for certain types of content, it may be inferred from the request for the

content that the user wishes to determine a rating." Receiving a signal is interpreted by

the examiner as being a request for a document.); and

determining whether to deliver the document in response to the signal based on

the criteria [threshold] and the rating information from the one or more evaluators (See

page 4, paragraph [0042] "...content for which a combined rating cannot be determined

and content for which a rating can be determined, but where the rating does not meet a

threshold set by the user, is not displayed by the client.")

7.   Regarding claim 2, **Hillis** discloses selecting a plurality of evaluators to rate the

document (see page 2, paragraph [0019] "...a rating system in which a client queries a

plurality of evaluation systems, according to an alternative embodiment of the

invention." And see page 2, paragraph [0022] "Generally, the ratings obtained from the

evaluation systems indicate the value of the content, as judged by an evaluation

authority that manages the evaluation system. An evaluation authority may be

commercial, such as the American Medical Association, or may be private such as a

peer of the user or the user himself."); and

passing the document to the plurality of evaluators for rating. (See page 2

paragraph [0019] "As in FIG. 1, a client 200 is communicatively coupled to a content

server 500 to which it submits request for content and from which it receives content.")

8.   Regarding claim 4, **Hillis** discloses determining an aggregate rating [ratings may

be combined] based on the rating information, wherein the action of determining

whether to deliver the document is further based on the aggregate rating of the document. (See page 3, paragraph [0030] "The ratings may be combined by any number of methods. In the case of numerical values, the ratings may be combined in an averaging scheme, preferably a weighted averaging scheme, in which the user values the opinion of the evaluation authority that manages each evaluation system. Medians and modes may be computed to discern a consensus among the evaluation systems.")

9.   Regarding claim 7, **Hillis** discloses identifying at least one trust score [weights], wherein each trust score is associated with a specific one of a plurality of evaluators [evaluation authority] (See page 3, paragraph [0030] "...in which the weights reflect the relative degree to which the user values the opinion of the evaluation authority that manages each evaluation system.");

determining an aggregate rating based on the rating information and the at least one trust score, wherein determining whether to deliver the document is further based on the aggregate rating. (See page 3, paragraph [0030] "in the case of numerical values, the ratings may be combined by an averaging scheme, preferably a weighted averaging scheme...")

10.   Regarding claim 10, **Hillis** discloses at least one trust score [weightings] is based on an industry associated with the associated specific one of the plurality of evaluators. (See page 4, paragraph [0050] "Specifically, the evaluation profile indicates that the evaluation system managed by the American Medical Association has a weighting of

15, the evaluation system managed by the Centers for Disease Control has a weighting of 7..." These are examples of industry specific evaluators.)

11.   Regarding claim 17, **Hillis** discloses the document comprises at least one of a web page, content that can be used in a web page, and a program.   (See page 1, paragraph [0005] "Many sites found on the World Wide Web allow users to evaluate content found within the site.")

12.   Regarding claim 18, **Hillis** disclose the action of selecting a plurality of evaluators to evaluate the document. (See page 2, paragraph [0019] "...a rating system in which a client queries a plurality of evaluation systems, according to an alternative embodiment of the invention." And see page 2, paragraph [0022] "Generally, the ratings obtained from the evaluation systems indicate the value of the content, as judged by an evaluation authority that manages the evaluation system. An evaluation authority may be commercial, such as the American Medical Association, or may be private such as a peer of the user or the user himself.")

13.   Regarding claim 24, **Hillis** discloses the aggregate rating comprises a quantity. (See page 1, paragraph [0010] "In the preferred embodiment of the invention, the rating obtained from each evaluation system is a numeric value.")

14.   Regarding claims 25, 26, and 27, **Hillis** discloses the aggregate rating comprises a mean of the rating information, the aggregate rating comprises a mode of the rating information and the aggregate rating comprises a median of the rating information. (See page 1, paragraph [0010] "...means...") and see page 3, paragraph [0030] "The ratings may be combined by any number of methods. In the case of numerical values, the ratings may be combined in an averaging scheme, preferably a weighted averaging scheme, in which the user values the opinion of the evaluation authority that manages each evaluation system. Medians and modes may be computed to discern a consensus among the evaluation systems.").

15.   Regarding claim 28, **Hillis** discloses the request is received by at least one of a content provider and a user. (See page 2, paragraph [0022] "An evaluation authority may be commercial, such as the American Medical Association, or may be private, such as a peer of the user or the user himself." Here, the request to rate the document is sent to the user.)

16.   Regarding claim 29, **Hillis** discloses a computer readable medium encoded with computer program code to rate an electronic document, the program code effective to perform the following: receive rating information associated with a document from one or more evaluators (See page 3, paragraph [0028] "Each of the evaluation systems that have evaluated the content of interest returns a rating, preferably numeric.");

receive a signal [request] relevant to a criteria (See page 2, paragraph [0026]

"Alternatively, for certain types of content, it may be inferred from the request for the

content that the user wishes to determine a rating." Receiving a signal is interpreted by

the examiner as being a request for a document.); and

determine whether to deliver the document in response to the signal based on

the criteria [threshold] and the rating information from the one or more evaluators (See

page 4. paragraph [0042] "...content for which a combined rating cannot be determined

and content for which a rating can be determined, but where the rating does not meet a

threshold set by the user, is not displayed by the client.")

17.   Regarding claim 30, **Hillis** discloses a system comprising rating receiving means

for receiving rating information associated with a document from one or more evaluators

(See page 3, paragraph [0028] "Each of the evaluation systems that have evaluated the

content of interest returns a rating, preferably numeric.");

Signal receiving means for receiving a signal [request] relevant to a criteria (See

page 2, paragraph [0026] "Alternatively, for certain types of content, it may be inferred

from the request for the content that the user wishes to determine a rating." Receiving a

signal is interpreted by the examiner as being a request for a document.); and

Determination means for determining whether to deliver the document in

response to the signal based on the criteria [threshold] and the rating information from

the one or more evaluators (See page 4. paragraph [0042] "...content for which a

combined rating cannot be determined and content for which a rating can be

determined, but where the rating does not meet a threshold set by the user, is not

displayed by the client.")

18.   Regarding claim 31, **Hillis** discloses a system comprising a rating receiving

device that receives rating information associated with a document from one or more

evaluators (See page 3, paragraph [0028] "Each of the evaluation systems that have

evaluated the content of interest returns a rating, preferably numeric.");

a signal receiving device that receives a signal [request] relevant to a criteria

(See page 2, paragraph [0026] "Alternatively, for certain types of content, it may be

inferred from the request for the content that the user wishes to determine a rating."

Receiving a signal is interpreted by the examiner as being a request for a document.);

and

a determination device that determines whether to deliver the document in

response to the signal based on the criteria [threshold] and the rating information from

the one or more evaluators (See page 4. paragraph [0042] "...content for which a

combined rating cannot be determined and content for which a rating can be

determined, but where the rating does not meet a threshold set by the user, is not

displayed by the client.")

19.   Regarding claim 32, **Hillis** discloses a method comprising the steps of receiving

rating information for an electronic document from a plurality of evaluators (See page 3,

paragraph [0028] "Each of the evaluation systems that have evaluated the content of

interest returns a rating, preferably numeric."); wherein at least one evaluator

[evaluation authority] is associated with a trust score [weights]; (See page 3, paragraph

[0030] "...in which the weights reflect the relative degree to which the user values the

opinion of the evaluation authority that manages each evaluation system."); and

determining an aggregate content rating for the electronic document by

aggregating the rating information from at least two of the plurality of evaluators, (See

page 3, paragraph [0030] "The ratings may be combined by any number of methods. In

the case of numerical values, the ratings may be combined in an averaging scheme,

preferably a weighted averaging scheme, in which the user values the opinion of the

evaluation authority that manages each evaluation system. Medians and modes may

be computed to discern a consensus among the evaluation systems."); wherein the

rating information for at least one trust score [weight] is considered in association with

the trust score for the evaluator. (See page 3, paragraph [0030] "...in which the weights

reflect the relative degree to which the user values the opinion of the evaluation

authority that manages each evaluation system.")

20.   Regarding claim 33, **Hillis** discloses a method comprising the steps of:

transmitting a signal to a server, the server interpreting the signal as being associated

with a criteria for a document (See page 2, paragraph [0026] "Alternatively, for certain

types of content, it may be inferred from the request for the content that the user wishes

to determine a rating." Receiving a signal is interpreted by the examiner as being a

request for a document.); and determining whether a document is to be delivered based

in part on rating information received from a plurality of evaluators for one or more

documents and whether the one or more documents relate to the criteria; and receiving

a document in response to the signal. (See page 4, paragraph [0042] "...content for

which a combined rating cannot be determined and content for which a rating can be

determined, but where the rating does not meet a threshold set by the user, is not

displayed by the client.")

21.   Regarding claim 34, Hillis discloses a method comprising: receiving one or more

documents from a server system (See page 2 paragraph [0019] "As in FIG. 1, a client

200 is communicatively coupled to a content server 500 to which it submits request for

content and from which it receives content."); and providing rating information to the

server system for use by the server system (See page 3, paragraph [0028] "Each of the

evaluation systems that have evaluated the content of interest returns a rating,

preferably numeric.") in determining whether to deliver the one or more documents in

response to requests for the one or more documents based on the rating provided. (See

page 4, paragraph [0042] "...content for which a combined rating cannot be determined

and content for which a rating can be determined, but where the rating does not meet a

threshold set by the user, is not displayed by the client.")

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

22.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

23.   Claims 3, 5, 6, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Hillis** as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of **Dahlstrom et al.** (hereinafter **Dahlstrom**, US 2005/0144297).

24.   Regarding claim 3, **Hillis** teaches a method substantially as claimed. **Hillis** does not explicitly teach the signal is a request received from an entity, the entity is associated with a suitability standard, and the determining action comprises determining whether the document satisfies the suitability standard. However, **Dahlstrom** teaches the signal is a request received from an entity, the entity is associated with a suitability standard [website is found to be appropriate], and the determining action comprises determining whether the document satisfies the suitability standard. (See page 2, paragraph [0007] "If the website is found to be appropriate for viewing based on the settings, the access request is sent to the computer network layering or protocol to which the original request was routed.") It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Hillis** with that of **Dahlstrom** because both are related to evaluating and regulating content on the internet and by including a suitability standard as disclosed in **Dahlstrom**, the ratings that are derived as disclosed in **Hillis** can be used to block access to inappropriate materials based on the standard for a particular user. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include the signal is a request

received from an entity, the entity is associated with a suitability standard, and the

determining action comprises determining whether the document satisfies the suitability

standard.

25.   Regarding claim 5, **Hillis** teaches a method substantially as claimed. **Hillis** does

not explicitly teach determining an aggregate rating based on the rating information; and

selecting the electronic document based on the aggregate rating and the suitability

standard.   However, **Dahlstrom** teaches determining an aggregate rating based on the

rating information; and selecting the electronic document based on the aggregate rating

and the suitability standard. (See page 2, paragraph [0007] "If the URL is found, a

message including URL ratings for the website is sent to the client computer.... The

client computer compares the URL ratings to the web access settings for the user

attempting to access the Internet.") It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill

in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Hillis** with that of

Dahlstrom because both are related to evaluating and regulating content on the

internet and by including the addition of a suitability standard as disclosed in

Dahlstrom, with the aggregate rating as disclosed in **Hillis,** appropriate relevant

documents, based on the standard for a particular user, can be provided. It is for this

reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include

determining an aggregate rating based on the rating information; and selecting the

electronic document based on the aggregate rating and the suitability standard.

26.   Regarding claim 6, **Hillis** teaches a method substantially as claimed. **Hillis** does

not explicitly teach storing the suitability standard in a database; and processing the

database to determine the suitability standard. However, **Dahlstrom** teaches storing the

suitability standard in a database; and processing the database to determine the

suitability standard. (See page 3, paragraph [0030] The cache 108 is preferably

implemented as a text file or database that is stored in computer memory." And see

page 3, paragraph [0031] "The logic module 106 compares the URL ratings to the web

access settings for the user attempting to access the Internet 101.") It would have been

obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the

teachings of **Hillis** with that of **Dahlstrom** because both are related to evaluating and

regulating content on the internet and by including a database as disclosed in

Dahlstrom, the method is more robust because multiple user suitability standards can

be defined and stored for use on any computer where internet is being accessed. It is

for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include

storing the suitability standard in a database; and processing the database to determine

the suitability standard.

27.   Regarding claim 22, **Hillis** teaches a method substantially as claimed. **Hillis**

does not explicitly teach the aggregate rating comprises one or more subject ratings,

each associated with an evaluation criterion. However, **Dahlstrom** teaches the

aggregate rating comprises one or more subject [categories] ratings, each associated

with an evaluation criterion. (See page 4, paragraph [0034] "The web access settings

defined at operation 218 in FIG. 2 are subdivided into multiple categories for better

specification of the subject matter to which access is controlled.") It would have been

obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the

teachings of **Hillis** with that of **Dahlstrom** because both are related to evaluating and

regulating content on the internet and by including one or more subject ratings, as

disclosed in **Dahlstrom**, the method is detailed because it can be fine tuned for specific

things to look for. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have

been motivated to include teach the aggregate rating comprises one or more subject

ratings, each associated with an evaluation criterion.

28.   Regarding claim 23, **Hillis** teaches a method substantially as claimed. **Hillis**

does not explicitly teach the evaluation criterion comprises at least one of sexual

content, violent content, adult content, and targeted age. However, **Dahlstrom** the

evaluation criterion comprises at least one of sexual content, violent content, adult

content, and targeted age.   (See page 4, paragraph [0034] "...the categories within

specific control settings are defined include, but are not limited to 'Language', 'sex and

nudity', 'violence'....") It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention to combine the teachings of **Hillis** with that of **Dahlstrom**

because both are related to evaluating and regulating content on the internet and by

including the particular types of subject ratings, as disclosed in **Dahlstrom**, the method

is detailed because it can be fine tuned for specific things to look for. It is for this reason

that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include teach the

evaluation criterion comprises at least one of sexual content, violent content, adult

content, and targeted age.

29.   Claims 8, 9, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over **Hillis** as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of **Perkins** (US 7,072,888).

30.   Regarding claim 8, **Hillis** teaches a method substantially as claimed. **Hillis** does

not explicitly teach at least one trust score is based on the geographical location of the

associated specific one of the plurality of evaluators. However, **Perkins** teaches at least

one trust score is based on the geographical location of the associated specific one of

the plurality of evaluators. (See column 3, lines 50-52 "Profiles may include information

as to whether the user is a home or a business, geographic location, typical spending,

etc.") It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the **Hillis** and **Perkins** because they both are related to feedback

from users and by including geographic location as disclosed in **Perkins**, the method

can be more precise delivering more accurate results. It is for this reason that one of

ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include at least one trust score is

based on the geographical location of the associated specific one of the plurality of

evaluators.

31.   Regarding claim 9, **Hillis** teaches a method substantially as claimed. **Hillis** does

not explicitly teach at least one trust score is based on one or more prior content ratings

received from the associated specific one of the plurality of evaluators. However,

Perkins teaches at least one trust score is based on one or more prior content ratings

received from the associated specific one of the plurality of evaluators. (See column 12,

lines 44 – 48 "The profile not only contains information supplied by the user, but also

contains information pertaining to the user's previous searches, resources visited and

ratings of those resources.") It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention to combine the **Hillis** and **Perkins** because they both are

related to feedback from users and by including prior content ratings as disclosed in

Perkins, the method can be more precise delivering more accurate results. It is for this

reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include at least

one trust score is based on one or more prior content ratings received from the

associated specific one of the plurality of evaluators.

32.   Regarding claim 15, **Hillis** teaches a method substantially as claimed. **Hillis**

does not explicitly teach at least one of the plurality of trust scores is based on at least

one of the geographical location of the associated evaluator and prior rating information

received from the evaluator. However, **Perkins** teaches at least one of the plurality of

trust scores is based on at least one of the geographical location of the associated

evaluator and prior rating information [ratings of those resources] received from the

evaluator. (See column 3, lines 50-52 "Profiles may include information as to whether

the user is a home or a business, geographic location, typical spending; etc." And see

column 12, lines 44-48 "The profile not only contains information supplied by the user,

but also contains information supplied pertaining to the user's pervious searches,

resources visited and ratings of those resources.") It would have been obvious to one

with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the **Hillis** and

Perkins because they both are related to feedback from users and by including

geographic location as disclosed in **Perkins**, the method can be more precise delivering

more accurate results. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have

been motivated to include at least one of the plurality of trust scores is based on at least

one of the geographical location of the associated evaluator and prior rating information

received from the evaluator.

33. Claims 11, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over **Hillis** as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of

Mascarenhas (US 2003/0014428).

34. Regarding claim 11, **Hillis** teaches a method substantially as claimed. **Hillis**

does not explicitly teach at least one trust score is based on a rating deviation of an

evaluator, wherein the rating deviation is based on a comparison of (i) rating information

for one or more documents received from the evaluator and (ii) rating information for the

one or more documents received from one or more other evaluators. However,

Mascarenhas teaches at least one trust score is based on a rating deviation of an

evaluator, wherein the rating deviation is based on a comparison of (i) rating information

for one or more documents received from the evaluator and (ii) rating information for the

one or more documents received from one or more other evaluators. (See page 3,

paragraph [0044] "An optional interface for acquiring profiles of experts: Input from each expert source may be normalized for certain variables, based on attributes measured for that expert source. For example, mean ratings and distributions collected and analyzed from each expert source may allow that expert's rating input to be expressed as standard deviations from the mean.") It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to combine **Hillis** with that of **Mascarenhas** because both are related to rating content and by including the rating deviation as disclosed in **Mascarenhas,** a more accurate method is developed because the scores can be adjusted if they are consistently inconsistent with other evaluators. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include at least one trust score is based on a rating deviation of an evaluator, wherein the rating deviation is based on a comparison of (i) rating information for one or more documents received from the evaluator and (ii) rating information for the one or more documents received from one or more other evaluators.

35.   Regarding claim 12, **Hillis** teaches a method substantially as claimed. **Hillis** does not explicitly teach at least one trust score is based on a rating deviation of an evaluator, wherein the rating deviation is based on a comparison of (i) rating information for one or more documents received from the evaluator and (ii) aggregate ratings for the one or more documents. However, **Mascarenhas** teaches at least one trust score is based on a rating deviation of an evaluator, wherein the rating deviation is based on a comparison of (i) rating information for one or more documents received from the

evaluator and (ii) aggregate ratings [composite rating] for the one or more documents.

(See page 3, paragraph [0044] "An optional interface for acquiring profiles of experts:

Input from each expert source may be normalized for certain variables, based on

attributes measured for that expert source. For example, mean ratings and distributions

collected and analyzed from each expert source may allow that expert's rating input to

be expressed as standard deviations from the mean." And see page 3, paragraph

[0041] "A composite rating may be computed from the mean of multiple ratings received

under a single taxonomic category.") It would have been obvious to one with ordinary

skill in the art to combine **Hillis** with that of **Mascarenhas** because both are related to

rating content and by including the rating deviation as disclosed in **Mascarenhas,** a

more accurate method is developed because the scores can be adjusted if they are

consistently inconsistent with other evaluators. It is for this reason that one of ordinary

skill in the art would have been motivated to include at least one trust score is based on

a rating deviation of an evaluator, wherein the rating deviation is based on a comparison

of (i) rating information for one or more documents received from the evaluator and (ii)

rating information for the one or more documents received from one or more other

evaluators.

36.   Regarding claim 13, **Hillis** teaches a method substantially as claimed. **Hillis**

does not explicitly teach the trust score of an evaluator is based on rating information

previously received from the evaluator for one or more documents. However,

Mascarenhas teaches the trust score of an evaluator is based on rating information

[expert's rating input] previously received from the evaluator for one or more

documents. (See page 3, paragraph [0044] "An optional interface for acquiring profiles

of experts: Input from each expert source may be normalized for certain variables,

based on attributes measured for that expert source. For example, mean ratings and

distributions collected and analyzed from each expert source may allow that expert's

rating input to be expressed as standard deviations from the mean." Here, the trust

score is based on prior ratings as well.) It would have been obvious to one with

ordinary skill in the art to combine **Hillis** with that of **Mascarenhas** because both are

related to rating content and by including the rating deviation as disclosed in

Mascarenhas, a more accurate method is developed because the scores can be

adjusted if they are consistently inconsistent with other evaluators. It is for this reason

that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include the trust score

of an evaluator is based on rating information previously received from the evaluator for

one or more documents.

37.   Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Hillis** as

applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of **Kirshenbaum et al.** (hereinafter

Kirshenbaum, US 2004/0199584). **Hillis** teaches a method substantially as claimed.

Hillis does not explicitly teach determining one or more revised trust scores for one or

more of the plurality of evaluators; and determining a revised aggregate rating [user

models] based on the one or more revised trust scores. However, **Kirshenbaum**

teaches determining one or more revised trust scores [credibility] for one or more of the

plurality of evaluators [users]; and determining a revised aggregate rating based on the

one or more revised trust scores. (See page 3, paragraph [0025] "Those users (e.g.,

12) who have previously provided reliable and useful feedback are given more

credibility in their future feedback, and user models change more quickly in response to

feedback from more credible users.") It would have been obvious to one with ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention combine **Hillis** and **Kirshenbaum** because

both are related to acquiring feedback or ratings on content and by including a revised

trust score as taught in **Kirshenbaum**, the method is more accurate, taking into account

that trust scores can change over time. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in

the art would have been motivated to include determining one or more revised trust

scores for one or more of the plurality of evaluators; and determining a revised

aggregate rating [user models] based on the one or more revised trust scores.

38.   Claim 16 is are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Hillis as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of **Hosea et al.** (hereinafter

Hosea, US 2005/0204276). **Hillis** teaches a method substantially as claimed. **Hillis**

does not explicitly teach the document is an advertisement. However, **Hosea** teaches

the document is an advertisement. (See page 5, paragraph [0043] "The components

include but are not limited to text, images, advertisements and links to other Web

pages.") It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to combine **Hosea** with **Hillis** because both are related to personalization

of content and by including advertisements as disclosed in **Hillis**, the method is

optimized to produce better results from the user by showing relevant advertisements.

It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to

include the document is an advertisement.

39.   Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over **Hillis** as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of **Ahlander et al.**

(hereinafter **Ahlander**, US 2005/0060404).

40.   Regarding claim 19, **Hillis** teaches a method substantially as claimed. **Hillis**

does not explicitly teach the plurality of evaluators are selected using a random

selection algorithm. However, **Ahlander** teaches the plurality of evaluators [content

rater] are selected using a random selection algorithm.   (See page 3, paragraph [0037]

"A content rater can be selected, for example randomly based on how long the content

rater has been idle, based on policies or a rating service provider, etc.") It would have

been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine

Hillis and **Ahlander** because both are related to evaluating content and by including the

random selection as disclosed in **Ahlander**, the method can be more efficient by not

needing to review particular criteria before assigning an evaluator. It is for this reason

that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include the plurality of

evaluators are selected using a random selection algorithm.

41.   Regarding claim 20, **Hillis** teaches a method substantially as claimed. **Hillis**

does not explicitly teach the criteria comprises a sensitivity score.   However, **Ahlander**

teaches the criteria comprises a sensitivity score [threshold rating]. (See page 4,

paragraph [0050] "Threshold rating 213 can be adjusted to increase the amount of

content that is assigned a content rating or increase the accuracy associated with

assigned content rating.") It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention to combine **Hillis** and **Ahlander** because both are related

to evaluating content and by including a sensitivity rating as disclosed in **Ahlander**, the

method can be more precise by not allowing certain content through for particularly

sensitive users, specifically on issues that are of increased importance. It is for this

reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include the

criteria comprises a sensitivity score.

42.	Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Hillis** as

applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of **Mascarenhas** (US 2003/0014428).

Hillis teaches a method substantially as claimed. **Hillis** does not explicitly teach

receiving new rating information for the document; and processing the new rating

information to determine a revised rating associated with the document. However,

Mascarenhas teaches receiving new rating information for the document; and

processing the new rating information to determine a revised rating associated with the

document. (See page 14, paragraph [0224] "Another user who would review the same

document and provide a similar rating could very well select different categories and

different significance ratings even for the same categories. In a preferred embodiment,

these different significance vector values are averaged and the resulting vector with the

averages is saved with the document along with a 'number of raters' value which is

used to compute the new average.") It would have been obvious to one with ordinary

skill in the art to combine **Hillis** with that of **Mascarenhas** because both are related to

rating content and by including the revised rating as disclosed in **Mascarenhas,** a more

accurate rating is developed because the scores are adjusted to consider the new

evaluators. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to include receiving new rating information for the document; and processing

the new rating information to determine a revised rating associated with the document.

43.   Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Hillis** in

view of **Zigmond et al**. (hereinafter **Zigmond**, US 6,698,020). **Hillis** discloses a

method comprising the steps of: receiving content rating information from a plurality of

evaluators (See page 3, paragraph [0028] "Each of the evaluation systems that have

evaluated the content of interest returns a rating, preferably numeric."); determining an

aggregate rating based on the rating information (See page 3, paragraph [0030] "The

ratings may be combined by any number of methods. In the case of numerical values,

the ratings may be combined in an averaging scheme, preferably a weighted averaging

scheme, in which the user values the opinion of the evaluation authority that manages

each evaluation system." Here, Hillis is referring to content in general and never

specifically discloses advertising.);

        Hillis does not explicitly disclose the content rating information being associated

with an advertisement, at least one of the plurality of advertisers is a partner

advertisement listings provider, receiving a request for electronic delivery of one or

more advertisements that satisfy ad content criteria; and determining whether to deliver

the first advertisement in response to the request based on the ad content criteria and

the aggregate rating.

However, **Zigmond** discloses the content rating information being associated

with an advertisement (see column 13, line 51 "...the content rating of the selected

advertisement..."), wherein at least one of the plurality of advertisers is a partner

advertisement listings provider (See column 8, lines 12 – 29 "Any number of entities

may be the advertisement content provider or, in other words, the party responsible for

making the advertisements available to an advertisement source 62 and an ad insertion

device 60....content provider is the advertiser...advertisement content provider is the

same as the video programming content provider...third party advertisement content

provider..."); receiving a request for electronic delivery of one or more advertisements

that satisfy ad content criteria (See column 4, lines 45 – 48 "At the appropriate time

indicated by the triggering event, the video programming feed is interrupted and the

selected advertisement is displayed to the viewer using a display screen..." and see

column 7, lines 30 – 32 "An advertisement 59 that has been selected according to any

desired method is then displayed to the viewer using display device."); and determining

whether to deliver the first advertisement [select advertisement] in response to the

request based on the ad content criteria [parental lock code or other indications..] and

the aggregate rating [content rating of the selected advertisement]. (See column 13,

lines 48-54 "The ad selection criteria 83 could be used to select advertisements having

different content ratings depending on the content rating of the program being watched

by the viewer. Alternatively, the content rating of the selected advertisement may be

coordinated with the parental lock codes or other indications of preferred or permissible

programming content stored in the home entertainment system.")

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the teachings of **Hillis** with that of **Zigmond** because **Hillis** is

related to evaluating content to provide a higher value or more pertinent product to the

user and **Zigmond** is also involved in providing more closely targeted content to the

user, but more specifically electronic advertisements. By including advertising content

as disclosed in **Zigmond**, to the aggregate rating as disclosed in **Hillis** the method

would be more likely to generate higher revenues for the advertisers by including better

targeted advertising. Also, by including a partner advertisement listings provider, more

potential ads can be made available and revenue can be generated from partners

simply by displaying their ad when it is more relevant. It is for this reason that one of

ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include the content rating

information being associated with an advertisement, at least one of the plurality of

advertisers is a partner advertisement listings provider, receiving a request for electronic

delivery of one or more advertisements that satisfy ad content criteria; and determining

whether to deliver the first advertisement in response to the request based on the ad

content criteria and the aggregate rating.

Conclusion

44.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Gutta et al. (US 2003/0126267) discloses restricting access to electronic media

objects having objectionable content.

Allen et al. (US 2003/0217056) discloses manual rating of electronic information.

Cheung et al. (US 2004/0054661) discloses evaluation of content for search

listings and allows for manual evaluation.

Barry et al. (US 2004/0019523) discloses filtered and/or masked advertisements

over the internet.

Adjaoute (US 2003/0009495) discloses filtering electronic content and accepts

ratings from multiple sources.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis L. Vautrot whose telephone number is 571-272-2184. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Dv
21 September 2006

JOHN COTTINGHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

25 September 2006